Editorial

Abgrall, Rémi

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcpx.2019.100026

Journal of Computational Physics: X 3 (2019) 100026

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Computational Physics: X

www.elsevier.com/locate/jcpx

Editorial

The *Journal of Computational Physics:X*, the mirror journal of the *Journal of Computational Physics*, is being launched. I want to take this opportunity to comment on this event from the point of view of the editorial team. This editorial ends by a few words on the evolution of both journals.

Why JCPX, what is JCPX, what are the differences, if any, between JCP and JCPX?

JCPX is a direct response to a series of recent developments in scientific publishing. As Journal, JCPX it is aimed at further enabling the sustainable growth of open access publications, and of open science in more general.

In short, "after 1 January 2020 scientific publications on the results from research funded by public grants provided by national and European research councils and funding bodies, must be published in compliant Open Access Journals or on compliant Open Access Platforms",[1] and this will apply to grants given by the members of "the coalition of research funders that have committed to implement Plan S, known as cOAlition S".[2] The list of these agencies and supporting organisations can be found on the same web site, please consult https://www.coalition-s.org/ for a direct information.

The common goal seems to transit to a world of open access, with potential restrictions (under discussion) on the hybrid model, the use of green archiving (e.g. arXiv, HAL) and choice of licenses. If anything, these events sparked a wider discussion and a series of experimentation and innovation.

A full open access journal is a journal that exclusively publishes open access content, and hence can be accessed by any reader, worldwide, without any subscription fee. A hybrid journal is a subscription journal that publishes not only subscription articles but also open access ones. The Journal of Computational Physics, until recently, was a hybrid journal, and hence not a full open access journal.

To offer a clear choice and support all authors, Elsevier has created a series of new mirror journals where editorial quality can be sustained and continue to contribute to the journal's prestige. Authors simply get a choice of journal once the paper has been accepted: JCP for subscription articles and JCPX for open access articles. In both cases, however, the editors and editorial board/reviewers are the same and continue to work at the same high standards as before. The author's choice of final publication is blinded to editors and referees, and this is true at *any stage* of the submission/acceptance process. In any case, choosing JCP or JCPX has no influence on the editorial process.

From a librarian's point of view, this creates a new and clearly separate journal and improves transparency with respect to the costs of both reading and publishing. It also offers funding bodies and governments flexibility to impose mandates on authors and go in different directions as both Gold OA and Green OA (archiving) are now supported. It does away with the hybrid model that seemed to confuse people. The new model supports the transition to open access and open science, including sharing data and code.

Of course, we, the editorial team, and I, as Editor-in-Chief, with the help of the Elsevier teams, have been very careful in launching JCPX. Let me explain in more detail how we will maintain high editorial standards, i.e. the quality of peer-review reports and ultimately the Journal.

JCPX is the mirror journal of JCP, and the workflow is the same. This means that:

- When a paper is submitted, it is sent to me, and then, with the help of the executive editors, we dispatch them to the associate editors. It also can happen that a submission is desk rejected, either because the quality is not judged good enough, or because the submission is clearly out of scope. For those that survive the first filtering step, the review process starts.

[1] Source: https://www.coalition-s.org/10-principles/.

[2] Source: https://www.coalition-s.org/implementation/.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcpx.2019.100026

- The choice of journal (JCP or JCPX) made by the author is blinded to Editors and Reviewers. This rules out any bias for either of the publishing models during the above filtering step or subsequent review and the accept/reject decision.
- Authors are given a choice between the Parent and Mirror title at submission and are still able to change their choice at revision and acceptance stage.
- We will collect funding and affiliation details to identify authors and link them to an existing open access agreement, if possible, to facilitate the choice.
- We will also identify in-progress manuscripts for which the author's journal choice is missing and allows authors to add a choice before acceptance.
- There is no delay at acceptance stage provided authors indicate their choice early.

This editorial workflow guaranties that the exact same standards are applied to both journals, and whatever your choice, you continue to benefit from the high reputable journal standards exactly as it has been all over the years.

The main drawback of any new journal is its inevitable delay in acceptance by abstracting and indexing services. Since mirror journals continue an established editorial tradition, this selection process can be speeded up in many cases, offering almost instant coverage by DOAJ, Google and Scopus (with its CiteScore and CiteScore Tracker). Coverage by Clarivate only starts after a sufficient time has passed as they generally need more time to evaluate. However, this evaluation is expected to be faster than launching a completely new journal from scratch with unknown editorial standards. At any rate, visibility of your work is guaranteed and supported by open access when publishing in this new journal.

In my view, this should not be a drawback for authors, since the quality will remain the same, and more and more institutions use metrics in a more sensible manner, having adopted the DORA principles (https://sfdora.org).

I also take this opportunity to draw your attention a slightly revised Aims and Scope for both journals. The journal is interested in how to represent, in modern computers, the mathematical formulation of physical models. The word "physical" must be read in a very broad sense: physics of course, but also chemistry, mechanics, fluids, solids; multi-scale problems, etc. The word "represent" is to be understood as methods and algorithms. We are neither a physics journal nor a mathematics one. I think the editorial board reflects this, and this has always been the case since the creation of the Journal in 1965.

Associate editors join with a mandate of 3 years, that can be renewed. This mechanism also supports ongoing evolution of the journal's editorial team and its scope.

I take this opportunity to thank the authors, the reviewers and the editors for their commitment.

Editor in chief of JCP and JCPX
Rémi Abgrall
E-mail address: remi.abgrall@math.uzh.ch

11 March 2019
Available online 16 May 2019